

The Address—Mr. Nielsen

in Canada on March 15, 1963 (Report of the Director of Investigation and Research, Combines Investigation Act for the year ended March 31, 1963). Your committee recommends that this study be resumed on a continuous basis and broadened to cover both food retailing and manufacturing in Canada with a particular view to examining concentration, market power and trade practices in the relations between retailers and suppliers.

● (8:30 p.m.)

There is another subject I wish to mention. The committee took no stand one way or the other on the value, either actual or potential, of the consumer co-operative movement.

Some of us are very strong in our view that the consumer co-operative movement is one of the best agencies for standing up to private monopoly control in this country. We know its effect is potential rather than actual, but our committee did make a recommendation. We said that quite regardless of the value of the co-operative movement, actual or potential, we felt that "legislation governing the incorporation of co-operatives is long overdue."

I think I have just about taken up my time and covered my points, and am about to bring my remarks to a close. I believe the members of the committee were hard working and co-operative. They were a fine group of people to work with, and I felt we advanced well, working together and sharing each other's points of view. We were clear and open about our differences but we found that the edges of our agreement were quite numerous.

In closing I would emphasize that the longest journey begins with a single step. In my view the first steps to the promised land are legislative measures designed to meet the bread and butter needs of the people. I do not think there is any use talking to a man about a glorious sunset when his stomach is empty. There is no use talking about the glorious things that can be introduced by way of legislation in years ahead if we are not going to deal with the bread and butter needs of the people today. I hope the government will concentrate on the first steps which are necessary to achieve this better living about which it is so eloquent in the speech from the throne. If it does so, it will have the co-operation of all of us, all the way.

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I join with others who have extended their congratulations to the mover and the second-er of the address in reply, the hon. member for Burin-Burgeo (Mr. Jamieson) and the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Côté), who have done as best they could with a document

[Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway).]

which can only be described as a political catch-all in an effort to cover up and to fill in the terrible gaps and the deficiencies of the government in this centennial year.

We in the Yukon, sir, are very cognizant of the issue that has been raised by the amendment put forward by the official opposition. We have been pressing the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Laing), who I am happy to see in his seat this evening, for a greater measure of self-control, but we have had nothing from him, from his officials and from the government but lip service, empty promises, meaningless phrases and downright, fraudulent answers to our legitimate demands. The minister has said that we are moving toward a greater control of our own affairs in the Yukon. Nothing could be further from the truth: Indeed we are moving in the opposite direction. But there will be other occasions upon which I can deal specifically with the Yukon.

Today we are dealing with a matter of transcendent importance to all Canadians, a description by which Yukoners are very proud to call themselves, in this day of division and this day of confusion, confusion which has been aided and abetted by the N.D.P. with their subamendment, which we find completely unsatisfactory. The only result that can be expected from the N.D.P. subamendment is further delay and further division. If accepted it would delay any hope of a constitutional conference this year. It would divide those already estranged by the failure of the government to act in the critical area of national unity.

The subamendment is typical of the party that produced it: long on theory and surface gloss and completely lacking in practicality. The N.D.P. subamendment is simply a smoke-screen. It is, sir, a watered down version of Liberalism and an escape hatch for the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) and the government. I am sure those on my left know that the Prime Minister desperately wants to avoid a constitutional conference because the inevitable result of such a conference will be to expose the folly of Liberal policies of opting out, the two nations theory, the two pension plans, from which the Prime Minister is desperately trying to disengage himself.

The subamendment that the N.D.P. proposes gives the Prime Minister a way out, and this in itself is regrettable because if such a conference is to be at all effective, the maximum effect can be attained in this year above all other times. There is great danger